

November 2005

Update: Crime Victim Rights Manual (Revised Edition)

CHAPTER 5

Victim Privacy

5.9 Limitations on Access to Court Records

A. General Provisions Limiting Access to Court Records

Insert the following text before the September 2005 update to page 107:

Transcripts generated from court proceedings and filed with the court clerk “are a part of the record for purposes of a sealing order” issued pursuant to MCR 8.119(F). *UAW v Dorsey*, ___ Mich App ___, ___ (2005).

CHAPTER 8

The Crime Victim at Trial

8.14 Former Testimony of Unavailable Witness

C. Defendant's Right to Confront the Witnesses Against Him or Her

Insert the following language after the July 2005 update to page 264:

A non-testifying serologist's notes and lab report are "testimonial statements" under *Crawford v Washington*, 541 US 36 (2004). *People v Lonsby*, ___ Mich App ___, ___ (2005). In *Lonsby*, a crime lab serologist who did not analyze the physical evidence testified regarding analysis that was performed by another serologist. The testimony included theories on why the non-testifying serologist conducted the tests she conducted and her notes regarding the tests. In *Crawford*, "the Court stated that pretrial statements are testimonial if the declarant would reasonably expect the statement will be used in a prosecutorial manner and if the statement is made 'under circumstances which would lead an objective witness reasonably to believe that the statement would be available for use at a later trial.'" *Lonsby, supra* at ___, quoting *Crawford, supra* at 51–52. The Court of Appeals found that because the serologist would clearly expect that her notes and lab report would be used for prosecutorial purposes, the information satisfies *Crawford*'s definition of a "testimonial statement." The *Lonsby* Court stated:

"Because the evidence was introduced through the testimony of Woodford, who had no first-hand knowledge about Jackson's observations or analysis of the physical evidence, defendant was unable, through the crucible of cross-examination, to challenge the objectivity of Jackson and the accuracy of her observations and methodology. Moreover, because Woodford could only speculate regarding Jackson's reasoning, defendant could not question or attack Jackson's preliminary test results or the soundness of her judgment in failing to conduct additional tests. Therefore, the introduction of Jackson's hearsay statements through the testimony of Woodford falls squarely within *Crawford*'s prohibition of testimonial hearsay that is reasonably expected to be used by the prosecution at trial. Because there is no showing that Jackson was unavailable to testify and that defendant had a prior opportunity to cross-examine her, the admission of the evidence violated defendant's Confrontation Clause rights, as defined by the United States Supreme Court in *Crawford*." [Footnotes omitted.] *Lonsby, supra* at ___.